

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585
Docket No. 1982-0133P
February 9, 2004
Art Unit: 2697
Page 16 of 21

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-24 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15 are independent.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicant thanks the Examiner and her Supervisor for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on January 14, 2003. In the interview, it was agreed that Terashita (USPN 5,767,983) cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest keeping historical information for image processing.

WITHDRAWAL OF DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, and 9. See *Office Action of April 25, 2003, page 2; Final Office Action, page 2, item 1.*

ACCEPTANCE OF DRAWINGS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for approving the corrected drawings submitted on July 18, 2003.

§ 102 REJECTION - TERASHITA

Claims 1-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Terashita. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, "acquiring a former image characteristic data which" and "calculation means which calculates, based on the current ... and the former image characteristic data, a correction parameter." Independent claims 2, 8, 9, and 15 recite similar features.

As noted above, it was agreed during the January 14, 2004 interview that Terashita may not be relied upon to keep historical information for image processing. Therefore, independent claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15 are distinguishable from Terashita.

Claims 3-7, 10-14, 16, and 18 depend from independent claims 1, 2, 8, 9, or 15 directly or indirectly. Therefore, these dependent claims are also distinguishable from Terashita

for at least the reasons stated above with respect to the independent claims as well as on their own merits.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18, based on Terashita, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS - TERASHITA, SUZUKI

Claims 17 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Terashita in view of Suzuki et al. (USPN 5,768,403, hereinafter "Suzuki"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

It is noted that claims 17 and 21-23 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 15. It has been shown above that claim 15 is distinguishable over Terashita. Suzuki has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct at least the above-noted deficiencies of Terashita. Therefore, independent claims 15 is also distinguishable over the combination of Terashita and Suzuki.

Due to dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 17 and 21-23 are also distinguishable over the combination of Terashita and Suzuki.

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585

Docket No. 1982-0133P

February 9, 2004

Art Unit: 2697

Page 19 of 21

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 17 and 21-23, based on Terashita and Suzuki, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS - TERASHITA, KUBO

Claims 19-20 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Terashita in view of Kubo et al. (USPN 5,828,461, hereinafter "Kubo"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

It is noted that claims 19-20 and 24 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 15. It has been shown above that claim 15 is distinguishable over Terashita. Kubo has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct at least the above-noted deficiencies of Terashita. Therefore, independent claims 15 is also distinguishable over the combination of Terashita and Kubo.

Due to dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 19-20 and 24 are also distinguishable over the combination of Terashita and Kubo.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 19-20 and 24, based on Terashita and Kubo, be withdrawn.

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585

Docket No. 1982-0133P

February 9, 2004

Art Unit: 2697

Page 20 of 21

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of is attached hereto.

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585

Docket No. 1982-0133P

February 9, 2004

Art Unit: 2697

Page 21 of 21

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter

Reg. No. 29,680

HNS
MKM/HNS:kss
1982-0133P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000